REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 10-19 are all the claims presently pending in the application.

It is noted that the claim amendments, if any, are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention, and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicant specifically states that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Claims 7 and 15-17 stand potentially rejected under 37 CFR §1.75 as substantial duplicates of each other. Applicants believe the claim amendments above to these claims, by re-instating the dependency of the claims (and by thereby correcting the claim status in view of the amount of previously-paid claim fees) that were inadvertently removed in the previous Amendment remedy this potential rejection, since the scope of these claims are different by reason of their respective dependency on different claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this potential rejection.

With respect to the prior art rejections, claims 1-7 and 10-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by newly-cited U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2004/0043798. Claims 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by US Patent No. 6,477,372 to Otting et al.

These rejections are respectfully traversed in the following discussion.

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

As described and defined in, for example, claim 1, the present invention is directed to a method of network acquisition for a cellular radio communications device arranged for operation in accordance with a plurality of radio technologies. One radio technology is searched to identify a suitable cell. Subsequent to identifying a suitable cell on the one radio technology, cells on another of the plurality of radio technologies are also monitored in order to identify if one of the monitored cells is more suitable than the cell identified on the one radio technology. Subsequent to monitoring, the cell identified from all of the radio technologies searched as being the most suitable is selected and camping for the first time

occurs onto that cell.

The conventional method demonstrated in Figure 1, initially camps onto the first cell identified as satisfactory. If the subsequent search of other technologies identifies another better cell, the device must then de-camp from the initial cell in order to re-camp onto the newly-identified, more suitable, cell. As explained at lines 22-28 on page 2 of the original specification, this conventional method causes significant loss of time and energy consumption.

The claimed invention, on the other hand, teaches that the initial camping onto a satisfactory cell can occur only after determining the most suitable cell, including searching the other technologies for that most suitable cell, thereby precluding the time and energy expenditure of the conventional method in which camping must occur to a new cell.

II. THE PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

The Examiner alleges that Amerga anticipates the claimed invention defined by claims 1-7 and 10-19, and that Otting anticipates claims 18 and 19. Applicants submit, however, that there are elements of the claimed invention which are neither taught nor suggested by Amerga or Otting.

More specifically, a key feature of the present invention is that the *initial* camping does not occur until after all the RATs are monitored to determine which station is the most suitable. This process eliminates the need to go through the complicated and energy consuming task of having to de-camp from one initial cell should another cell be determined as more suitable and camping again to that more suitable cell.

Applicants submit that, to one having ordinary skill in the art, neither Amerga nor Otting teaches this method of initial camping.

First, relative to Amerga, this reference actually addresses the process of emerging out of the idle mode (see, e.g., the title and the description in paragraph [0002] and, particularly, paragraph [0024], wherein it is described that "*A mobile station first accesses a system (during power-up, for example), and selects a base station or serving cell, with which to establish communication, in accordance with certain cell selection conditions. A mobile station may be in idle mode, that is without an active call or data session in progress. In idle*

mode, the mobile station can intermittently monitor the serving cell to, among other things, determine if an incoming call is being directed to the mobile station. In a typical wireless communication system, a mobile station will maintain communication with, or "camp" on, a single cell while in the idle mode." Thus, by definition, from this description in paragraph [0024], Amerga has already selected a cell during initial power-up upon which to camp and, therefore, does not address this initial camping selection.

In the rejection currently of record, the Examiner attempts to take wording out of context from the environment described therein. That is, the Examiner points to steps 802, 808, 810, and 834 and accompanying description in paragraphs [0079], [0080], and [0082].

However, Applicants submit that the description in paragraph [0018], as confirmed by the wording in the other paragraphs, clearly indicate that the process in Figure 8 involves a cell re-selection process as the system emerges from the idle mode and does not involve the initial camping process at powerup. The method in Amerga has already camped out once when it enters into the idle mode. The possible re-selection process described in this reference is directed to the process of emerging from the idle mode, not the initial camping process that occurred during the initial power-up.

In contrast, the present invention does address the initial selection of the camping selection at power-up.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection based on Amerga.

Applicants submit that Otting likewise addresses a process that occurs after the initial camping process has occurred, as clearly described at lines 12-15 of column 2: "*Therefore, the need exists for a method to allow a mobile unit to perform alternate radiotelephone system scans without missing paging messages on the system where it is presently camped,*"

Alternatively, Applicants submit that Otting fails to provide the same mechanism of camping on the cell, as required by the plain meaning of the claim language.

That is, the Examiner points to items 410, 412, 414, and 404, along with the description at lines 10-46 of column 6. However, Applicants bring to the attention of the Examiner the description at lines 12-16 of column 6: "*At power up 400, the mobile radiotelephone proceeds to scan 402 for service in the multiple radio technologies in which the radiotelephone is capable. When the mobile has completed its scan, it registers, if*

necessary, and camps 404 on the best available network."

Applicants submit that this process differs from the plain meaning of the claim language of the present invention defined by the independent claims 18 and 19 (and shown in Figure 2 of the present Application), wherein the best cell is determined, after monitoring all the RATs, for purpose of determining the specific cell for the initial camping.

In contrast, as described at lines 48-51 of column 4, Otting defines camping as involving the coordination between the mobile station and the base station of the network, a different concept from the plain meaning of the description in claims 18 and 19, wherein the initial camping involves the most suitable cell.

Hence, turning to the clear language of the claims, in Otting there is no teaching or suggestion of: ".... determining which cell is most suitable, after monitoring more than one radio technology (RAT) for possible cells; and camping onto said most suitable cell as an initial camping", as required by claim 18. Independent claim 19 has similar language.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection based on Otting.

III. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-7 and 10-19, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 4/28/06

Frederick E. Cooperrider, Esq.
Registration No. 36,769

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386

McGinn IP Law Group, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254